

### REMARKS

Claims 1-4 have been cancelled and Claims 5-24 have been added. Claims 5-24 remain in the application. The specification has been amended to correct typographical errors and overcome the objection to the disclosure. No new matter is added by the amendments to the specification and the new claims.

In the Office Action dated March 19, 2003, Paper No. 5, the Examiner objected to the drawings because they do not include reference signs and that some are color photographs. Attached hereto is a set of four (4) sheets of proposed formal drawings for review by the Examiner. No new matter is added by these substitute drawings. The proposed drawings reduce the number of figures and correspond to the original drawings as follows:

Proposed Fig. 1 shows the mini scooter of original Fig. 1 prior to installation of the retrofit kit.

Proposed Fig. 2 shows the mini scooter with retrofit kit of original Fig. 1.

Proposed Fig. 3 shows the retrofit kit of original Fig. 3.

Proposed Fig. 4 shows the collar of original Fig. 11.

Proposed Fig. 5 shows the motor bracket with thumbscrew of original Fig. 9.

The Examiner objected to the disclosure due to informalities. Attached is a substitute specification, in both a clean version and a marked up version, which Applicant believes addresses all of the specific examples identified by the Examiner and other informalities noted by Applicant. Also, the specification has been amended to reflect the change in the number of drawing figures.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant cancelled Claims 1-4 and added Claims 5-24 to overcome this rejection.

The Examiner stated that the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. The Examiner cited the U.S. Patent No. 4,958,842 issued to Chang; the U.S. Patent No. 5,848,660 issued to McGreen; the U.S. Patent No. 6,347,681 issued to Patmont et al.; the U.S. Patent No. 6,431,301 issued to Forbes; and the U.S. Patent No. 6,431,302 issued to Patmont et al. Applicant has reviewed these references and does not believe that they show or suggest the claimed invention.

In view of the amendments to the specification, drawings and claims and the above arguments, Applicant believes that the claims of record now define patentable subject matter over the art of record. Accordingly, an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.